

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on June 6, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 5, 9 and 34 are amended, claims 35-36 are cancelled, and claims 37-38 are added; as a result, claims 1-34 and 37-38 are now pending in this application.

#### **Pending Claims**

In the last response, Applicant mistakenly copied the wrong pending claims into the response. The claims of the last response recopied claims 21-23 as claims 24-26. The present claims are correct.

#### **§112 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 5 recites the limitation “the cylindrical blower housing” in line 3 and was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation. Applicant has amended claim 5 to overcome the rejection.

#### **§102 Rejection of the Claims**

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Canada (U.S. 5,974,690).

Applicant traverses the rejection since the Canada reference does not include each limitation recited in the claim. For instance, Applicant cannot find in the Canada reference: an air filter cartridge adapted to be removably mounted within the filter holding section “through a top surface of the blower housing,” as recited in claim 1, in contrast, the filter 1, of Canada, is placed over the vent 2. It is not mounted through a top surface of the blower housing, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 2 includes each limitation of its parent claim and is therefore also not anticipated by the cited reference. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-11 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Sharples (U.S. D343,698).

Claims 8-11

Applicant traverses the rejection since the Sharples reference does not include each limitation recited in the claim. For instance, Applicant cannot find in the Sharples reference: at least one blower motor having a capacity for blow drying livestock, as recited in claim 8. In contrast, the Sharples reference shows a hair blow dryer.

Claims 9-11 include each limitation of their parent claim and are therefore also not anticipated by the cited reference. Moreover, Applicant has amended claim 9 to better describe the subject matter recited in the claim. Applicant has amended claim 9 to recite a nozzle with a circular attaching section. Such subject matter is not found in the Sharples reference. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 34

Applicant has amended claim 34 to include the subject matter of allowable dependent claim 36.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 4 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharples in view of Canada.

Claim 4

Claim 4 includes each limitation of its parent claim and is not obvious over the cited references for the reasons given above. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 16

Applicant traverses the rejection since, even if combined, the combination does not include or suggest each limitation recited in the claim. For instance, Applicant cannot find in the asserted combination: a filter cartridge removably mounted within the filter holding section “through a top surface of the blower housing,” as recited in claim 16. Sharples does not appear to include any filter and the Canada reference shows a filter placed over the vent. It is not mounted through a top surface of the blower housing, as recited in claim 16. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Claims 21-33 and 36 were allowed. Claim 34 has been rewritten to include the subject matter of allowed claim 36. New claims 37 and 38 depend from claim 34.

Claims 3, 7 12-15 and 17-20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 3, 7 12-15 and 17-20. However, since Applicant believes parent claims 1, 8, and 16 are allowable, Applicant reserves the right to rewrite the claims in a later response.

Claims 5 and 6 indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112 set forth in the Office Action. Applicant has amended claim 5 to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 359-3267 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.


Respectfully submitted,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 359-3267

Date 12/6/06

By   
Peter C. Maki  
Reg. No. 42,832

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 6<sup>th</sup> day of December 2006.

Jonathan Ferguson  
Name

  
Signature